DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 106 387 UD 015 115

AUTHOR Edmonds, Ron
TITLE Minimums and Maximums: A Theory and Design of Social Service Reform; [and Seminar Discussion].
PUB DATE 16 Apr 74
NOTE 75p.; Paper presented at the Seminar on Public Policy (Center for Urban Studies, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts, April 16,1974)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$3.32 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Change; Administrative Policy; Agency Role; Change Strategies; Community Agencies (Public); Community Role; Community Services; *Delivery Systems; Educational Change; *Intervention; *Social Agencies; Social Change; *Social Services; Social Work; Welfare Services

ABSTRACT

In 1974 American institutions of social service--i.e. nonprofit agencies whose purposes are to assist groups and individuals to maintain or advance themselves in the social order--are in the midst of a crisis of confidence. As a social order, Americans are least effective in delivering social service to those who are impoverished, of color, physically handicapped, or otherwise different in ways that are observable. Effective social service reform must be characterized by both technical proficiency and an institutional climate that acknowledges and respects the unique characteristics of the client population. The design for betterment presented here has three parts which, taken together, describe a method of successful intervention in social service delivery. First, clients must become as influential as constituents in defining the uses to which the social service setting will be put; second, the social servants, as internal advocates for reform, must develop and articulate a "maximum" concept of effective social service; third, the community to which the service is to be delivered must adopt the "utility of minimums" as the conceptual basis for describing improved social service. (Author/JM)

ED106387

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

MINIMUMS AND MAXIMUMS;

A THEORY AND DESIGN OF SOCIAL SERVICE REFORM

PUBLIC POLICY SERIES
HARVARD UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
CENTER FOR URBAN STUDIES
APRIL 16, 1974

UD 015115

RON EDMONDS
DIRECTOR
CENTER FOR URBAN STUDIES
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

MINIMUMS AND MAXIMUMS;
A THEORY AND DESIGN OF SOCIAL SERVICE REFORM

Institutions of social service are non-profit agencies whose purposes are to assist groups and individuals to maintain or advance themselves in the social order. Schools, adoption agencies, welfare agencies, and counseling centers are all examples of social service settings.

In 1974 American institutions of social service are in the midst of a crisis of confidence. We now know that as a social order, we are least effective in delivering social service to those who are impoverished, of color, physically handicapped, or otherwise different in ways that are observable.

The literature that describes the social pathology of our response to such individuals is both substantial and persuasive. Perusing that literature from the perspective of my own experiences as teacher, researcher, and administrator persuades me that our "bad" social service institutions are, for the most part, staffed by "good" men and women. Certainly there are teachers, social workers, doctors, and administrators who are racist, autocratic, ethnocentric, and, in general, personally and professionally repulsive. I do not believe such individuals constitute the norm among social servants. I rather believe that most social servants are decent men and women who work hard, and conscientiously strive to benefit the needful portions of our population. If you are prepared to accept such a characterization of social service settings and the people who staff them, you must acknowledge the paradox of bad social service being delivered by good people.

This discussion is prinicpally directed to those of good intention and thwarted purpose who daily participate in the paradox that is the object of these remarks. The paradox need not continue since my own experience illustrates that social service settings, serving all manner of American minorities, can be effective, efficient and, most importantly, respectful of those to be served.

I make this latter point because being respectful of those to be served is the minimal prerequisite to effective social service. A technically competent teacher who is disrespectful of students and parents cannot create or maintain that mood of consensus and cooperation that characterizes a good community school. Thus effective social service reform must be characterized by both technical proficiency and an institutional climate that acknowledges and respects the unique characteristics of the client population.

My design for betterment has three parts which, taken together, describe a method of successful intervention in social service delivery. First, clients must become as influential as constituents in defining the uses to which the social service setting will be put; second, the social servants, as internal advocates for reform, must develop and articulate a 'maximum" concept of effective social service; third, the community to which the service is to be delivered must adopt the "utility of minimums" as the conceptual basis for describing improved social service.

Clients are those individuals with whom the institution has direct contact, and who are present to receive the social service. Consitituents are those on whose behalf the social service is made available. When

a teacher is teaching, the students are clients. When an adoption worker arranges permanent parentage, the child being placed is a client.

Identifying constituents is more difficult, but may be made easier by putting the question --to whom does the teacher and other social servants think they must answer for their professional conduct?

The teacher's answer may describe a group as small as an elected board of education, or as large as the entire population of the school district. The group to whom the teacher feels accountable is constituent. Of particular importance in this discussion is the frequency with which social servants answer this hypothetical query by describing a population that does not include clients.

Constituency is a dynamic concept and may vary from social servant to social servant. At the core of the concept of constituency is the notion of representing interests and standards. The social servant who seeks internal reform must come to understand that the aura of respect I mentioned earlier requires perceiving of client as synonymous with constituent when interests and standards are being articulated.

Effective social service settings need not perceive of all constituents as clients, but all clients must be perceived of as constituents. It is a general principle of good social service that the constituent population is larger than the client population. Thus any institution that serves large numbers, but is answerable to small numbers cannot effect good social service.

By its very nature, social service requires a norm. Whether the social servant is a teacher, social worker, or counselor there must be a standard of personal attainment toward which the client is to move. In the instance of schooling, the norm may be as tangible as minimal competence in reading, writing, and computing, or as intangible as the teacher's perception of pupil behaviors that demonstrate socialization. "Good" school districts confer school skills that are explicitly or implicitly a response to parental consensus on the school skills prerequisite to mastery of the successive levels of schooling. Such socialization as may occur in a good school, derives its description of socialized behaviors from educator perception of parental behavioral norms. School districts that are "bad" or that become "bad" do so largely because of failure to effect or maintain a community dynamic characterized by responsiveness to the community such as I have described for "good" school districts.

In adoption, the norm may be placing a child in a family. In counseling, the norm may be full, useful, and gainful employment. These personal attainments are the objects of social service and the end toward which the social servant strives as he works with clients.

A basic issue in social service reform is the origin of the norm of personal attainment that describes successful social service. It is a premise of this discussion that successful social service can never be managed in a setting in which the norms are developed in consultation with constituents, but not with clients. In the instance of primary schooling, the teacher can never be instructionally successful when the standards of pupil performance are derived from groups that do not include a preponderance of the parents of the pupils.

Adoption agencies whose placement practices are designed to serve the parenting needs of adults with only modest attention to the parental needs of children cannot manage effective placement for all children who are adoptable. In the same way, counselors who define useful and gainful employment in exclusive consultation with employers can never offer employment counseling that will be in the best interests of clients. In each instance, the social service disability has its origin in the social servant's perceiving of a constituency that need not include clients.

The social servants who do not perceive of clients as constituents usually develop a set of professional behaviors that are proprietary and culturally autocratic. One of the cliches in social service rhetoric is that "we must help our clients to help themselves." That is a good cliche and forms a simple and proper basis for evaluating the appropriateness of the social servant's professional behavior. Clients in social service are being helped most when they are provided the means to greater appreciation and utilization of their own skills and resources. Recognizing client skills and resources that can be cultivated requires respectful appreciation of the unique characteristics that describe all individuals. Interacting with individuals on the basis of definition and standards that are not developed in close consultation with those individuals precludes insight into such skills and resources as they may represent.

There exists in social service a concept of the needs of Americans of color or modest means that is best characterized as the "deficit model." The "deficit model" proceeds from the assumption that the appropriate behavioral norm in the U.S. is exemplified by the white middle-class.

When using the "deficit model," an individual is said to be deficit to the extent he deviates from the behavioral norm that characterizes those who are white and middle-class. Thus to be a native born Spanish speaker is a deficit. To speak any of the ethnic dialects is a deficit. The "deficit model" defines cultural, dietary, entertainment or linguistic difference as a deficit. Urban, black people are considered deficit because they have habits of speech, dress, and behavior that do not conform to the middle-class norm. Chicanos are considered deficit for many of the same reasons.

Because Americans of color have been historically denied full participation in the social order, they are disproportionately in need of the services of social service institutions. When those institutions derive their norms of personal attainment from a white middle-class population, interaction with those who are different is characterized by an imposed diagnosis of the needs of those to be served.

By its very nature, the "deficit model" does not include client access to decisions affecting policies and practices of the social service institution. Title I funded Head Start programs remain the most frequent occasion of social service programs for pre-school aged children. The income eligibility for participation in such programs causes a disproportionate number of such children to be of color.

Pre-school programs like Head Start often use "packaged instruction." Historically, Bereiter & Engleman have been two of the most prolific producers of "packaged instruction." Their packages have often been explicitly directed at urban, black children whose pre-school language is a dialect. Such children are variously described as speaking a "black dialect," "substandard English," or "ghettoese." Bereiter & Engleman diagnose

such language as linguistically primitive. They further conclude that the linguistic characteristics of ghetto language is so primitive that it imposes habits of expression and conceptualization that constitute an "irreparable cognitive deficit." Thus, such children, their families and friends enter school with a social service definition of their needs that is imposed on them. Furtherrore, these children, having been categorized as deficient, are very unlikely to be appreciated or recognized for the unique skills and interests that characterize them.

The instructional personnel who use a Bereiter & Engleman packaged program are required to diagnose any child characterized by a black dialect as having a set of distinct deficiencies which must be overcome. Thus almost from the first moment of teacher-pupil contact, the quality of interaction is dominated by the prior definition of the child and his needs. Given such circumstances, it is easy to predict impending parent-pupil complaints about the high handed and autocratic attitudes of teachers, even if the instructional premises of the packaged program are never explicitly recognized.

This example is not intended to suggest that black children ought not have the opportunity to learn standard English. This example is intended to illustrate the ease with which decent men and women can participate in a social service dynamic characterized by profound disrespect for those to be served.

To advertise oneself as instructionally capable of teaching standard English for those who seek such instruction is one thing. To insist that children who do not speak standard English must receive such instruction is another thing. The former is the offering of an opportunity. The latter is the imposition of an autocratic norm.

Defining dialect as deficit is a giant step toward the characterization of urban, black children as "culturally deprived" and otherwise pathological. Such defining of client need from sources that do not include clients has, at least, two unfortunate social service consequences.

First, the definitions often turn out to be inaccurate. That there are impoverished Americans of color who are culturally deprived, cognitively deficit, and otherwise pathological is certainly true. That the incidence of such individual disability is as great as social service institutions would like to believe is certainly not true. Programs of instruction predicated on such a profound misunderstanding are bound to be educationally ineffective.

The second mischievous consequence of the imposition of a definition of client need is the effect on the social service milieu. When institutions compel individuals to conform to a set of capricious and autocratic expectations, abrasive interaction invariably occurs. If the social servant does not question the imposing of definitions of client need, then the social servant behaves as a sterotypical, rigid bureaucrat with a manner that is offensively arrogant. If the social servant has misgivings about the autocracy of his institution, then his behavior is either defensive or ambiguous and otherwise not helpful to the social service needs of the client.

Improving the quality of interaction in social service settings that impose definitions of need is a virtually impossible task. Neither staff courses in group dynamics, nor sensitivity sessions can alter the fundamental inappropriateness of institutional practice that is not mindful of the unique character of those to be served.

Defining clients as constituents creates a process of institutional decision making that can avoid or overcome these dangers. In the instance of schooling, educator consultation with parents, when such consultation is instrumental in defining instructional purpose, may profoundly alter the standard to be used in measuring satisfactory pupil progress.

Since standards of pupil progress must, for the foreseeable future, remain normative, it is essential that the parents of pupils be instrumental in the establishment of the norm if schools wish to work in a milieu characterized by community acceptance of, and support for, the instructional goals of the school.

The most singly pervasive characteristic of successful schooling is consensus between school and community on the uses to which the school is to be put. Parent accusations of teacher arrogance, indifference, or antipathy can be avoided only when parents can observe the positive relationship between their interests and the school's behavior. Institutional response to parental interests cannot occur unless one of two circumstances prevail.

The school can be in cultural conformity to the community of which it is a part. This often occurs in middle-class suburbs or rural settings characterized by minimally satisfactory family income and cultural homogeneity. In circumstances of cultural homogeneity and consensus, the school, no matter what policies and procedures it adopts, is rarely distant from the interests and expectations of the community it serves. Teachers are so like the families they serve, and so attuned to the social dynamic and community milieu that describes the community, that

the teachers almost invariably reflect the interests and disposition of the families of the children they serve.

In instances in which the community to be served is ethnically, racially, culturally or economically different from the middle-class milieu that characterizes teachers and schools, teachers cannot rely on their intuitive understanding of the community to know how best to proceed when the purpose is pupil progress that is both acceptable to, and appreciated by, the community. Such a circumstance requires school personnel to make parents and community representatives instrumental in determining the programs and instructional activities of the school. The community must be chiefly responsible for the school's perception of which bodies of knowledge and sets of skills will best prepare students to be of service to the community.

Thus clients become synonymous with constituents when, and only when, the social servant's definition of community need is principally determined by information provided by those to be served. Teachers thus develop standards of pupil performance principally as a function of interaction with the parents of their pupils. When this happens, the probability of mis-diagnosis of instructional need is dramatically reduced. Of equal importance, parents can observe the consequences of their willingness to share with instructional personnel parental standards for instruction and parental definition of the schooling needs of their children.

I turn now to the second part of my design.

In recent years, great efforts have been made at institutional reform. Substantial numbers of teachers, social workers, and other social servants have pursued a variety of strategies intended to alter the basis on which their institutions operated. These efforts have produced only modest gains in relation to need and effort. These tactical failings have most often occurred because of a failure to identify those fundamental institutional characteristics from which

disability flows. Effective internal advocacy of reform depends on the advocate addressing himself to the basic premises that describe the institution.

Social service practice is dictated by administrative rules and regulations. Institutional rules and regulations proceed from policy. Policy proceeds from premises which are a function of the decision maker's values and attitudes. Thus reform effort within an institution should be directed to those decisions that are of the most importance because their consequences are pervasive. Reform efforts that are exclusively invested in administration or policy rarely yield the gains that are sought.

Adoption agencies are a case in point. Substantial numbers of social workers in adoption agencies have struggled to alter the nature of service in their agencies. These internally generated reforms have usually consisted of activities such as recruitment of minority professional personnel, increased community contact in the form of addresses to civic groups and media descriptions of the agencies' services, and an effort to streamline the processing of prospective parents. These activities are usually intended to increase the number of children placed, especially those defined as "hard to place." The "hard to place" are children of color, children with physical or mental handicaps, or children over six months of age.

The kinds of activities described rarely generate levels of gain that satisfy the expectations of the internal reform advocates. More importantly, the gains do not bring the agency to levels of service that meet the needs of children who are not being served. This discussion proceeds on the assumption that no child in the custody of an adoption

agency should wait more than six months for placement.

The tactical failure of many internal reform efforts is a function of their superficial relationship to the origin of the institution's behavior. Recruiting minority staff rarely alters an institution's behavior unless the minority staff attends to the origin of the institution's behavior. Both administrative practice and policy proceed from the institution's basic notions of the uses to which the setting should be put. Thus one can manage considerable change in administrative practice only to discover that new policies and their subsequent administration recreate the negative circumstances that initially prompted the effort at internal reform.

The social servant is in a unique position to discern the fundamental premises to which I refer. Participation in the internal life of an institution offers one the opportunity to observe that staff respond to behavioral parameters set forth in institutional policy. Access to policy makers in a context of shared understanding of the institution and shared information that precisely describes institutional behavior lends itself to pursuit of the question "what is the origin of the policy makers' disposition to implement certain goals and standards of institutional behavior?" This question will yield little if it proceeds from the assumption that attending to written policy and administrative rules and regulations is sufficient for discerning the origin of the uses to which the setting is to be put.

In the instance of adoption, for example, recruitment of minority staff is a modest reform because staff of an institution usually behave in conformity to institutional policy. If policy is defective, the mere presence of minority staff will not improve administrative behavior. **14**

Minority staff may be sought to encourage applications from prospective minority parents, to make processing more comfortable, etc. If the criterion for successful service is the placement of more children, minority staff may discover that they are participating in a process that neither increases minority application nor makes parent processing more comfortable. Thus, despite the presence of minority staff, placement for children of color may not improve.

This discussion proceeds on the assumption that most adoption agencies have premises that are profoundly unresponsive to children. We come then to the basic perspective that describes the institutional approach to adoption and the impact of that premise on serving children.

In the United States, the function of adoption is to serve adults who wish to have children. Adoption agencies define their purpose as "creating families," "placing children in appropriate homes," etc. Such language should be considered in the context of the overall approach to placement that describes adoption agencies. In general, adults are being evaluated to discover whether or not they are deserving of the service the agency has to offer. Hence, rigorous and extensive tests must be passed if one is to qualify as a parent. The emphasis in the whole of this is on adults, not children.

Most adoption agencies prefer prospective parents who are biologically incapable of parentage. This is so because American adoption came into being as a consequence of the same ideology that produced compensatory education. The American norm is observable virility in men and maternity in women. The observable proof of one's passing the test of manliness and womanliness, thus defined, is biological offspring.

Failure to produce offspring deprives society of its superficial test of sexual acceptability and conformity. Individuals who cannot pass the test thus seek the means to mask their failure. It is in this context that one should consider the adoption worker's preoccupation with physical matching. Further, the purpose of the historic secrecy surrounding adoption was not to benefit the child, but to assist the adoptive parents in their masquerade as virile man and fertile woman.

The preceding is descriptive of certain early premises that characterized adoption. The rhetoric of adoption has evolved sufficiently to emphasize children, but that rhetoric does not proceed from a decision to make adoption a child-centered service. Thus adoption policies and practices continue to flow from an adult-centered premise of service while social servants struggle to develop practices that will better serve children.

One should consider the language that is used to describe any agency that lacks children for placement. Great lamentation is raised because needful adults are being deprived of the trappings of manliness and womanliness. An agency defining itself as child-centered would rejoice that there seemed to be fewer needful children than at an earlier moment.

One further point should be made in this regard. When agencies say they lack children, they usually mean they lack normal, white infants. Consider the ideology of service and cultural perspective that allows a social service agency to say it has insufficient children for placement while retaining custody of great numbers of children who are of color, over six months, or physically or emotionally handicapped.

The agency's dismissal of such children as "hard to place" or "unadoptable" is illustrative of cultural autocracy in two ways. First, there is the bias against peoples of color which makes serving children of color less urgent than serving children who are white. Second, placement of children who are different in the ways described does not facilitate masking the infertile adult by placing a child who is "matched" so as to seem a biological offspring of the infertile adult. Each of these culturally autocratic illustrations proceeds from an ethnocentric perception of constituency. That social servants define their constituents as white, even when serving clients of color, is fairly easy to discern. In the same sense, the effort to aid the infertile in seeming fertile proceeds from perceiving of constituents as normal by virtue of their biological parentage while the clients are deficient by virtue of their infertility.

Observation of these and other behaviors of any institution ought to raise serious questions about the uses to which the setting is being put. More importantly, internal reformers should proceed from the general principle that effective reform depends on access to those who define the uses to which a setting is being put. Given limited energies and resources, reform effort should bypass ascending levels of administration and decision making in pursuit of those individuals or that group from whom the institutional definition flows.

Every institutional behavior that has its origin in the culturally autocratic premises described earlier must be got rid of. Moreover, the adoption agency must so define itself as to preclude further policies and practices that proceed from cultural autocracy. That requires

analysis that goes beyond particular policy practice to a basic premise such as the adoption agency's perception of constituency.

As previously suggested, the social servant who defines himself as an internal advocate for reform brings the following resources to bear on the task of improving the institution's delivery of service: access to vast quantities of institutionally descriptive information; appreciation of the informal context that describes the social service setting; knowledge of, and contact with, other individuals who man the social service setting, and the opportunity for intimate interaction with the institution.

The language of internal change should be grand. My intent in making this suggestion is that the social servant engage in an analysis of his role as a social servant that will bring him to a subserviant and receptive frame of mind. The proper interaction between a social servant and the community he serves is one in which the social servant strives to understand how his professional resources can best advance the interests and needs of those he serves. The scenario I seek in my reference to "grand" is as follows:

The social servant begins by committing himself to the most auspicious standard of service. For example, the teacher vows "to prepare each student for the fullest realization of his intellectual and academic potential and the most positive participation in his community." Implementing such a standard necessitates criteria for judging academic and intellectual progress. Thoughtful social servants will soon recognize that "academic and intellectual potential" has no meaning outside of a community context. Realizing potential requires having some sense of the range of community need that should be addressed. It may well be that urban, black communities have greater need for architects

than veterinarians. What this is intended to suggest is that parental and community perception of pupil progress may be more tangible than the abstract goals to which some schools commit themselves.

In such a context of analysis, the social servant is brought to the question --what does the community need? Answering such a question identifies the social frame within which academic and intellectual progress can be assessed. When the community in question is of color, or otherwise different from the cultural context that describes a school, it becomes necessary to develop intimate insight into the community to answer the question of community need. Once community enters into the social servant's implementation of the auspicious standard to which he has committed himself, representatives of the community begin to be perceived of as the sources of intimate insight needed to ascertain community need.

The particular bodies of knowledge and sets of skills to be conveyed to the students derive from intimate interaction between the teacher, the parents, and other representatives of the community. The social servant's own analysis has thus moved from the grandiose and the abstract to the tangible and the practical. Equally important, the social servant has come to understand that the best social service requires definition by those to be served.

Once the teacher is brought to the realization that he cannot do his job to his own satisfaction without the help and guidance of those he is to serve, there comes into being the accepting frame of mind that can make clients become constituents.

The substance of this process should be interest in a more culturally neutral setting. Blaming the victim and requiring individuals to meet institutional expectations are manifestations of cultural autocracy.

The process of utilizing a description of the maximum social service outcome of institutional behavior eventually brings one to the substantive concept of cultural democracy as the basic premise from which an institution proceeds. The parent-teacher consultation described above is culturally democratic. Cultural democracy is a circumstance in which difference is acknowledged, understood, and appreciated.

The preceding is directed to internal institutional change. I turn now to externally imposed institutional change which is the third part of my design.

I define the community advocate as an external change agent. In contrast, the social servant is an internal change agent. The nature of external intervention in the life of an institution imposes dramatically different perspectives on how best to make progress. The recommendations made earlier regarding tactical perspectives on internal change have disastrous consequences when used by external change agents.

Community demands are usually couched in the language of maximums. Black students often demand "education that is responsive to black needs." Black parents often demand "education that will help our children realize their potential." Such language is tactically disastrous when the goal is institutional improvement. Abstract and grandiloquent description of the desirable outcomes of institutional behavior deprives the intervener of unambiguous measures for assessing institutional behavior.

What is wanted is a concept of institution-intervener interaction that will profit both, and ultimately improve the social service. It is the

responsibility of the institution to pursue lofty goals and to take fullest advantage of the body of knowledge and sets of skills the staff represent. It is the responsibility of the community to know precisely what service it seeks, and to have criteria for determining whether or not that service is being made available.

For example, schools describe themselves as teaching citizenship, civility, respect for others, and equally insubstantial characteristics. The words describe the maximum of institutional attainment. By their very nature, such goals preclude external observation and evaluation. Institutional decision-makers in a community exchange, based on such language, are protected from accountability, partly because the nature of the dialogue does not require the decision-makers to precisely articulate the service that is being delivered. Who knows whether or not citizenship is being taught? Parental interest in other services, such as reading, can be shunted aside by being placed in the larger context of the institution's presumed teaching of citizenship and equally abstract skills.

Allowing an institution to publicly commit itself only to grand and abstract goals leaves the institution free to use its own best judgment of how best to pursue its goals, and to describe whether or not progress is being made almost entirely on the basis of the social servant's feelings about what is going on. I use the word "feelings" to emphasize the imprecise and subjective language that must be used in discussing the abstract language of maximum institutional outcome.

The above may seem to contradict my earlier suggestion that the internal change agent should be grand in articulating his concept of

social service. The purpose of the internal change agent's exercise is to identify the origin and nature of the uses to which the setting should be put. Having done that, clients should be instrumental in future definition of the purpose of the setting. Using grand language in community-institution dialogue is inappropriate unless all parties in the dialogue agree that acceptable levles of service are being attained. Such is rarely the case. Institution-community dialogue usually occasions community effort to improve service.

Thus those who man the social service setting should enter the dialogue in a subserviant frame of mind, prepared to respond to the description of social outcome that is put forward by community spokesmen as the description of the uses to which the setting should be put. The grand description of social service should have brought the internal change agent to the belief that he is subservient to the wishes of the community of which he is a part.

Now consider the tactical efficacy of community use of the language of minimums in discussing whether or not a social service institution is fulfilling its obligation to serve community needs. The community advocate faces four distinct tactical necessities. First, he must generate constituency or coalition so as to profit from describing himself as representing substantial numbers, or the interests of substantial numbers. Second, he must effectively manage the public process of making demands of the institutional decision-makers. Third, he must have criteria for evaluating institutional response to his demands, which criteria must meet the test of being acceptable to his constituency or coalition. Fourth, he must be prepared to articulate the actions to be taken by the community, depending on the outcome of the demands that are made of the institution. Each of these processes

recommends the utility of minimums as the most effective tactical instrument.

Ordinarily, constituency or coalition grows out of community response to a visible spokesman who uses language that is dramatic, general, and vaguely responsive to such disquiet as may exist in the community in response to certain social service institutions. Coalescing around vague demands, such as "the schools should communicate with parents better," or "kids should get more out of being in school" is a very superficial and potentially disabling basis on which to generate constituency or coalition. The parties to this process have little sense of whether, and at what level, their interests coincide. Such groups often flounder when compelled to deal with specific institutional responses to vague community demands.

This discussion suggests that it is better to postpone community coalition rather than establish it on the basis of abstract maximums that will not survive confrontation. Community dialogue that seeks minimum and precise description of acceptable institutional behavior constitutes a firm basis on which to found constituency and coalition. For example, few parents would resist reading, writing, and computation as a minimal description of educational outcome. The sophisticated community advocate will discern the radical implications of community consensus on the desirability of universal primary pupil acquisition of these basic school skills. Such a goal is illustrative of the utility of minimums. Such a goal seems modest but is, in fact, ambitious because of the phrase "universal pupil acquisition."

There will be many in the group who will articulate interest in discipline, human relations, group dynamics, and a variety of other interesting, but imprecise, educational outcomes. Such goals should be resisted on the grounds that schools might well accept any or all of them without incurring the obligation to deliver observable and evaluative institutional behavior. In fact, schools, as presently constituted, cannot effect universal primary pupil acquisition of basic school skills.

If the community advocate has been persuasive in his advocacy of universal primary pupil acquisition of basic school skills as the definition of the community's standard of schooling, then the stage is set for making good use of the confrontation that should occur around that phenomenon. The central substantive issue is the community's response to "universally" successful primary pupil mastery of schooling. That means that no child, free of certifiable handicap, will be expected to acquire less than the community's definition of basic school skills.

Educator rejection of such a notion proceeds from two culturally autocratic premises. First, there is the widespread educator belief that pupil home life and social milieu are principal causes of pupil performance. Second, there is the educator rejection of community definition of schooling when the community does not fulfill the educator's cutlural expectations of what a community should be.

Both premises have the effect of placing the burden of performance on pupils with no concomitant responsibility for teachers. It is in such a context that educators reject universally successful primary pupil

mastery of basic school skills. Assuming that parents have a more accurate perception of their children's abilities than such educators, there will be dramatic educator community disagreement on the utility of universal primary pupil acquisition of basic school skills.

The community advocate can, therefore, predict dramatic confrontation, based either on the school's refusal to accept such a goal, or inability to meet it. Thus, as time goes on, the coalition or constituency will grow more cohesive, partly because of the precision of their shared interests, and partly because of the shared rejection of the institution's inability or refusal to meet so reasonable and seemingly modest a demand as universal primary pupil acquisition of basic school skills. If such demands can be extracted from community and coalition dialogue, the opportunity then presents itself for a deceptively dramatic presentation to institutional decision-makers. Large public notice should be taken of the presentation, more because of the advocate's representation of substantial numbers than because of the initial drama of the substance of the demands that are being made.

The tactical value of external institutional intervention, predicated on the tangible nature of the language of minimums, allows a calendar of response to be made a part of the presentation. The schools might be given an academic year in which to demonstrate substantial progress toward the goals. In Michigan, each community is annually provided public description of pupil performance. Such public information lends itself to the process that is being suggested. Any community that can agree on what constitutes minimally successful schooling has accomplished the first major step toward annual description of the primary school's competence.

The nature of the community demand being made logically proceeds to subsequent objective evaluation of the nature of movement toward the goal. Evaluation of minimal and precise institutional outcomes predicts two possibilities. There may be school systems that do, in fact, manage universal primary pupil acquisition of basic school skills. Such an event could occur only as a consequence of radical alteration in institutional behavior. There is not now, nor has there ever been in the United States, a school district that has managed to teach all primary pupils, free of certifiable handicap, to read, write, and compute to demonstrable levels of minimal competence. Therefore, any societal circumstances causing such a school district to come into being would be a success of the first order.

It is more likely that the school district will not have attained universal pupil acquisition of basic school skills, and that failure will have occurred substantially along class lines.

Such a moment confronts a community with the flagrantly discriminatory concept of social service that describes its schools and other public institutions. The confrontation cannot occur in the absence of unambiguous evaluation of institutional response to reasonable community expectations. The predictable school response to such a confrontation will consist of blaming the victim. The struggle is thus defined between the community advocate and his institutional protagonist. At issue will be a basic question such as --can schools be held responsible for children who violate institutional expectations by reason of culture, class, or other variables such as were discussed earlier?

The external change agent, in articulating minimal performance standards to be applied to the institution, has engaged in a reform effort with auspicious cultural and political implications. Culturally, the language of minimums seeks to neutralize a hostile social service setting. The neutrality occurs because the institution is being made to do the community's bidding. If that bidding provides community children with skills and knowledge that increase individual choice and confirm the legitimacy of community demands, then all manner of fortuitous benefits occur.

Three important factors relating to this discussion should be emphasized. First, the external change agent now represents the community with a set of specific and measurable institutional goals. Second, all resources for change can gravitate toward the precise and minimal reform agenda that has been articulated. Third, and most important, the tactics under discussion offer the greatest possibility of success in making social service institutions more responsive to poor minority communities. What is wanted is eventual success that will persuade poorly served communities that they need not despair of improvement in the quality of social service now available to them.

What is being tactically recommended is that such communities initially concentrate their reform energies on precise agreement and definition of minimally acceptable schooling and other social services.

In sum, my purpose has been to articulate a set of behaviors which might profitably engage the energies of a substantial number of men and women who are dissatisfied with the quality of social service

being provided by the institution of which they are a part. The process I have proposed combines some elements of participatory decision-making, community control, and organized community action. The substance of my suggestions is that cultural and institutional autocracy be replaced by an appreciation for difference that is best summarized as cultural democracy.

5

CARNEGIE FOUNDATION SEMINAR II

April 16, 1974

Bernice Miller - Associate Director of the Center for Urban Studies

Ron Edmonds - Director of the Center for Urban Studies

Ken Tollet - Professor of Higher Education, Director of the Institute for the Study of Educational Policy at Howard University

Ezra Naughton - Associate Secretary of the American Association of University Professors and Director of the Association's special project for Developing Institutions

Jeannette Feely - Doctoral candidate at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, a D. C. teacher on leave from the D. C. system, very much involved in teacher unionism and would like to make that more responsive to the needs of the clients of the union

Harold Lockett - Assistant Director of Hawthorne Center, a children's psychiatric hospital in Michigan, near Ann Arbor. Also in private practice in Ann Arbor, interested in education, having served on the Board of Education in Ann Arbor and also interested in adoptive agencies for children.

Robert Singleton - Director of the Education Finance Reform Project at Nairobi College in California

Ken Haskins - Vice-Superintendent of the schools in Washington, D.C.

Will Antell - On the Ed. School's faculty, visiting for one year. During the last six of seven years working with American Indian education.

Alan Schmid - Department of Agricultural Economics and Resource Development at Michigan State University. Interested in public investment analysis of public service projects. One of my students is doing a study on how community factors affect performance in schools and consensus on goals.

Peter Forsythe - From the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation in New York, Program Officer in charge of a children's program, formerly a social services administrator in the state of Michigan and an attorney

Robert Newby - Stanford Center for Urban/Rural Development in Research and Development in Teaching

Ira Goldenberg - Faculty at Harvard. Work in the area broadly called social intervention

Herm Coleman - Executive Secretary for Michigan Education Association. One of major objectives, sensitizing teachers to deal more fully with the educational concerns of students. Job probably 60% political and 40% administration.

Badi Foster: As I understand it, there are two items on our agenda. One is a critique of Ron's paper, and the second is the establishment of a new agenda for later attention. That is, the identification of tasks that can be done five or six months down the line; the kinds of research, training, and programs, that ought to be undertaken if a genuine alternative perspective is to be developed. I assume that that is why Carnegie gave the money and why we have assembled today. We want to develop a different and more effective perspective on the nature of the problems that Ron touched on today. Let's open it up to any comments, questions, reactions that you have to Ron's paper. Perhaps if we got a series of these out, we might find some common patterns to focus in on.

Bob Singleton: I'd like to know where Ron gets his optimism. What makes you think that the teachers who attach to the student some expectation level -- the Pygmalion effect*/ -- and then follow that out in terms of the treatment the student receives from the teacher -- what makes you think that these teachers are salvageable?

Ron: I think I get the optimism from three places. One, I get it from my own work in history. Occasionally I would run across periods in ancient societies where, in my judgment, for a time running from, say, ten to fifty years they were conducting a social order that was a model of response to difference. That's one. That said to me that it has been done, that there have been moments in the history of the world in a variety of places where it has been done. The second place from which I get my optimism is my observation that there are energies and resources in people that exceed our wildest

---

*Footnote Rosenthal

imagination. Consider those people who are required on a daily basis to struggle with the things that we just talk about, the people who are required every day to get up and to work and try to raise children, try to educate them and try to feed themselves and house themselves do so with the tenacity and the determination and a daily optimism that must at some level sustain them. There is a point in my comments and analysis where I stop and I say I don't know what happened, because I haven't the vaguest idea what things would be like if people were given the opportunity to do what they can. I don't know what a school would even look like if it got itself in the position of being genuinely responsive to the communities in this country that aren't served. Last, I have that optimism because I think that people in positions like ours are required to have it. I think that we are privileged, pampered, indulged people and that that imposes very special obligations on us. People who struggle every day in the ordinary ways I'm talking about can't afford, or it seems to me are entitled to give up, the choices we have, the insights we have, the prerogatives we have. We have an obligation to keep on no matter what. To me, pessimism is a luxury for people of this class, in these settings, doing these kinds of things and I am not even interested in considering, even entertaining any discussions of pessimism or abandonment because I don't think we have that right.

Ken Tollet: I have a combined question-comment. I was intrigued by the client constituency analysis and the necessity to expand the constituency. I am wondering what it is about this operation that would bring about some success. The thought occurred to me that family-community involvement is important not because it defines minimums which are amenable to assessment and attainment, but because it expresses parental and community interests

in children which stimulates and motivates learning or skill acquisition. I've always wondered about community control of schools and so forth. I think there is some legal problem as to whether you can really accomplish that. But the real payoff hypothesis is not in the family's or the broader community's definition of goals, but their participation in the educational process, which communicates to their children an interest in education which motivates them. I think that the value of PTA's in part stems from this, and the reasons we see certain kinds of educational attainment from middle class children is not because of innate ability, but because parents show an explicit interest in what's taking place in school, and their children's perception of this interest is a stimulant and a ot motivating factor in their own educational attainment. It means that we are really using a strategy to excite the community and parents about education, not so much about what takes place in educational institutions as such.

Ken Haskins: I think that that simplies things too much. I think that the question of the school taking its definition and its norms from its community is a much broader issue than just a matter of interest. From my experience in working with a relatively successful school that was community-controlled, I found that many times the things that schools and teachers are concerned about, if you don't make any definitions, are the outward kinds of behavior and at many times these take precedence over the things that schools say they are about. For instance, within a community in which children fight one another in order to achieve a particular kind of reputation, we insisted that teachers could not use "fighting"

as a reason to put a child out of the classroom and say they will not teach the child. Teachers were expected to teach that child even though he was a fighter, even though he might do other kinds of things that people would ordinarily use as an excuse not to even deal with the child. By our insistence that anything acceptable in the community would be acceptable in the schools and not used as an excuse to exclude people, we began to deal on a very different level. Now we also had to deal partly with the parents, because schools had a reputation for not allowing things to happen in the school that happened everyplace else. But parents became aware that we were concerned about it, that we stopped fights, and teachers would tell the children there might be a better way of handling things than fighting, but they wouldn't use fighting as a reason for exclusion or expulsion. Then the kind of minimums that Ron talks about, like reading and math and these kinds of things, became the only things teachers would allow people to attend to and comment upon, rather than the other things. I just used that as an example.

Ira Goldenberg: When reading Ron's paper, and then listening to the first couple of questions and comments today, I got the feeling that I was being transported by an almost spiritual urging of my soul to uplift itself, to probably one of the most concrete models that I had ever seen which brings together three different intervention techniques -- the binding together of something like the participatory decision making, community control, and community action. What puzzles me is the intervening variable, the mediating link between a kind of a spiritual uplifting so that every person addresses that part of himself or herself that is best (which I

think is what you call the source of agency), and a very concrete action plan for how to get something changed. For me, the mediating link has to do with the kind of an assessment one makes of the fundamental purpose of not only the educational system or the social service delivery system, but also the relationship between that social service delivery system and the long-term historical, economic, exclusionary goals of the major society. It's that mediating link that for me is the problem. In the work that I've done, I've found that the real difficulty lies in conceptualizing that mediating link. For me, that mediating link has become simply recognizing the overwhelming force and power, however self-contradictory or painful, of what a society that is basically committed to the pursuit of goods and power means in terms of establishing socializing institutions, which schools are, in terms of preparing people -- not only for participation but preparing them for exclusion. When I begin to look at that as a fundamental purpose I begin to understand how good people, as you put it, can do terribly bad things because they tend not to look at things any more in terms of individual souls or individual uplifting or individual anything, but rather as response patterns of people who have learned to survive, and if survival means excluding someone else then all elaborate ways of conceptualizing that process simply still comes down to the necessity, the requirements of a society for an excluded population. That, for me, is a very heavy thing to deal with as a mediating link between the two parts of Ron's paper that I applaud.

Bob Newby: First of all, the proposal to me is a profound proposal, but where I have problems with it has to do with the assump-

tions we make about what social service institutions are supposed to do in the first place. Ira has mentioned part of what is bothersome to me. Social service institutions are supposed to maintain, or assist people to maintain or advance themselves in a social order. But that's not what schools are supposed to do. What schools are supposed to do, at least in the society presently, is to allocate people to certain roles, which means allocating certain people to failure, which means that one of the purposes of the institution is not to advance people in the social order but to program them for some other role in the social order. That is bothersome. We are talking about the fact that schools are political institutions. Coming to grips with that, interfacing that with your proposal for making the changes, is a very difficult task, I think.

Ron: I both recognize and subscribe to those critiques, but I have, in a sense, a rationale for what isn't there, part of what you two are talking about. Yes, I agree this is an avaricious, materialistic, capitalistic society and all that and so forth and so on, but that's not where I am, I mean, I advertise myself as having some skill in the management of institutions like schools. That's what I can do and that's what I tell people I can do and if we agree then I attempt to deliver that service. Now if I just say that the society is racist and capitalistic, then I am almost tempted to dismiss it. If I get the opportunity to be President -- I don't particularly want the job -- but I'd take it. In the absence of that, then, I will do what I can with what I have, where I am. And where I am is in education and that means that it may be that the larger characteristics of the social order

suggest that the schools will never be improved. But in the meantime, even if that is true, I must nonetheless, as long as I choose to work in education, operate on the assumption that schools can be made better, that it's my obligation to try to make them better, and failing that, I have to find something else to do. But I still, despite what you say and my being able to subscribe to it, I'm still not pessimistic. I'm not pessimistic, because the odds may be against us but it seems to me we have to try anyway.

Badi Foster: We've been using education primarily as the example; however, it was this morning's illustration of the amputee that I found most jarring, largely because it took me out of the usual kinds of analogies and cliches that I am familiar with, so I invite the people who are not involved professionally in education but in other social service institutions, to begin to come in on the discussion.

Herm Coleman: I think it is a damned good proposal. There are two areas I would like to speak to within the proposal; one is actually missing from the proposal and the other I don't think is elaborated on enough. On my first reading, I was very excited about it; then I backed up and said, "Wow, I'm really getting a narrow, simplistic perspective about institutional reform, institutional change." I think there needs to be a preface to the paper that deals with the complexity of problems in changing institutions. Those who have not dealt with the question of institutional change, I think, could get a rather narrow and parochial kind of perspective on the issue from just reading what you have, Ron. The other issue I would raise, which you spoke to in one paragraph in your paper and you mentioned in your comments earlier, is the issue of cultural relevance in the context of reforming

social institutions. I can buy your argument that we need not deal with it if racism did not exist. I say the impact of racism has caused me to have some negative feelings about myself, my self-worries, my self-concepts. I think the whole notion of humanizing education, value clarification, cultural relevance, has to be viewed within the context of reforming social institutions, recognizing the impact of racism on institutional reform, and the way in which culturally different persons perceive themselves in the society in general. I feel very strongly about that as a part of your systemic approach here, Ron.

Ron: That's a very important critique, and I've thought a lot about what you've just said. I have a very explicit reason for saying I want schools to be culturally neutral and I do not want to talk race or culture (unless I'm in a community control school of the kind Ken represents). It is racist that schools systematically deprive poor black children of the ability to read. That's racist. So, to me, it is non-racist if they are taught to read. However, my own experience in institutional intervention is that if you approach the school and you say what you want them to do is to cease being racist, that doesn't work; it's too abstract, it's too intangible, and they can do all manner of things in the namesof combatting racism which turn out to be very mischievous. However, if you say instead that you're not going to even talk about race, then the issue can be clearly stated: that you want to hold the teacher responsible for teaching all the children in the classroom to read. The truth is you can not teach a heterogeneous pupil population to read by homogeneous instructional methods. Therefore, a school that turns out to be instructionally effective is in fact compelled to make a culturally relevant response

to the nature of its pupil population. But I want to reverse the order in which that happens. I do not want the school to do cultural things in which instructional effectiveness is incidental. I want the school to do instructional things in which you come to the necessity of culture as part of instructional strategy. And therefore, what you discover with poor black children is that you do not set out in the first instance to deal with the nature of being poor and black, you set out to find the means to teach them what their parents want them to know and what you think you ought to teach them. What you will come to as a teacher is the necessity to put instruction in a cultural context. But you don't do that in the name of cultural relevance. You do that in the name of instructional effectiveness. My own judgment is that educational intervention in which the sparrow that you keep your eye on is instructional effectiveness, is a far more effective approach than intervention in which the agenda is race, culture, ethnicity and all the rest, because I just don't think schools can manage that unless they come at it backwards.

Herm Coleman: I think you can do both, Ron. I don't think the question of cultural relevance is going to ever surface in the narrow, simplistic perspective that you've got here. What do you do in a situation where, you mentioned the Bereiter-Engleman stuff, . . . let's just take that particular set of resources, for example. Level 3 of that stuff is the most racially biased material you could find anywhere, yet it is being used and you've got Third World kids there. This teacher is deploying all those diverse strategies, but yet as I look at that supplemental resource, I am consciously and subconsciously being told that if I'm not white, I'm less than equal; I don't care what kind of strategy

that teacher is using. So it seems to me that no matter how that teacher defines those goals and what is said verbally, there's still a negative thing being used in the school environment that needs to be addressed, that could be addressed, in my mind, within the context of the minimal objectives developed by the external and internal reform advocate.

Ron: For me, I want to dismiss Bereiter and Engleman, not on the grounds of its being racist material, but because Bereiter and Engleman is not instructionally effective for a sufficient portion of the pupil population to remain as a pervasive instrument. That's why I want to reject B-I, and if you ask me in public why it ought to be rejected, it seems to me you ought to do an analysis of the pupil performance outcomes as a consequence of B-I materials and it can be rejected on those grounds without having to deal with its racism.

Ken Haskins: I think one thing we have to be careful about is that we do not begin to add on to what Ron defines as minimum. Another point I want to raise: there are institutions are there are situations where people are forced to deal with diversity because there are institutions and there are situations that are made diverse in order to keep other situations homogeneous, like the bottom-level high school is that which is left over after all the other groups are formed. Or when I worked at Wilkswood School for Boys, that was the kid that nobody else would pick and so you ended up with a kind of diversity there. And there are strategies that people either deal with -- either they see themselves -- again a question of constituency. They either see themselves responsible to those groups that are intact and become custodial to keep those diverse groups from interfering with the functioning

of the homogeneous groups, or they see themselves as serving these groups. That sets an introduction for my raising a question. Is there some significance in this particular topic being raised in this group of people at this particular time? Without any research, it seems to me that members of the black community believe that because of the way they've been forced into certain kinds of living conditions, that they have had to, in some ways, handle and deal with diversity in their own communities much more so than others -- that different classes sometimes live in the same community, that people who would be called deviant in other communities find a level of acceptance. I wonder whether or not -- people raised the question of optimism and pessimism -- whether or not there is any significance to this particular subject being formulated in this way at this particular time with this group. I don't mean to move you away from your non-racial, non-cultural thing except that it did come up here and I would just like to raise that question.

Jan Feely: The more I've thought about what has been said, the more I realize that the absence of discussion of race and ethnicity, etc., made possible a political strategy for trying to right some of the ills within the social service agencies. I'm still coming to grips with that as it appears here. I have had to ask myself several kinds of questions, particularly with regard to the internal and external advocates. Being a school teacher, I'm sensitized to what happens in schools. It has not been made worthwhile for teachers to be advocates of their clients, the students they teach or their parents or other people in the community. What I want to know is whether or not it is going to be possible, as an outcome of the approach that you have here and this series of seminars, to draft or devise various sets of strategies that can be used in various settings for identifying those internal and external advocates, putting together the kind of long-range study that looks at kids in schools from their entry into school through whatever is the

highest point of attainment. Maybe you know of something that has been done that deals with the population that is disenfranchised educationally, that would serve as a guide for how we can really see to it that we bring about reform, seemingly in a simplistic manner, but actually having all of the necessary pieces to make the approach meaningful. If we can set up one such study that serves as a model in one social service agency, maybe we could have it for several of the agencies and then come to grips better with how we can bring about the reform that needs to take place. That's a long range kind of thing. I'm just wondering if we will eventually get to that point.

Badi Foster: I'm wondering whether we can broaden this discussion a little bit to get outside of education and the people who are involved with social service institutions.

Harold Lockett: As you know, I am a psychiatrist and I work in a state-run institution for the treatment of emotionally disturbed children. As I listened to the comments and as I read Kon's paper, I tried to put it into the context of what I am doing or what the agency in which I work does for children. We get children from basically all socio-economic backgrounds and the percentage of black or minority group youngsters runs lower than the general population of the area we serve.. For example, we do not get as many children, black children, referred to us as is in proportion to the population of our catchment area. Consequently, the first question that I asked was, "Why weren't these children referred?" Then when you look at the source of the referrals you begin to get some measure. Schools are a source. They refer a lot of children to us. My catchment area covers Detroit and its surrounding suburbs, and we've had very few referrals from Detroit because the teachers didn't refer. The teachers, and I'm sure a significant number of black teachers and administrators, did not feel that the Center was responsive to the needs of black kids. Probably it was not as responsive as it should be or could be, but it certainly was more responsive than they

thought it was. But that information was really not available to them. The other sources are private people, agencies, and it is interesting that when they refer children, the kind of children who are referred are those who could be described as "kind of given up on" in many ways. These children have multiple handicaps, and to use the model of the amputee or the one-armed person, you should see some of these children in terms of their handicaps. I deal with a selected group of children, all of whom are in the category described as minority; they are emotionally disturbed, they are academically retarded frequently, they have organic problems at times. They come from family backgrounds which are not necessarily the kind we generally think of as the best for children and they frequently have been, in another context, outside families. Indeed, for much of their lives, they have been involved in multi-family relationships. Because they come to our agency from these sources with these kinds of handicaps, it's very difficult for me to conceptualize what the minimums for these children might be described as, or who will describe the minimums. Will it be the agency? Will I describe the minimum? Who will describe the minimum from their point of view? Will it be their parents, or their teachers, or other referring agencies? Or will it be them? Some of these children are very young, like three, four, five, on up to seventeen. The input of the client has to be added to by some parent surrogate or parent, or some other person who can vocalize for them what they are missing. In this context, I believe the agency where I work tends to give service as much as possible, but the overwhelming needs of these children preclude the kind of minimum projection that was described and can be described with schools. The other thing is the interlocking relationship between agencies.

If I begin to describe what I do with children, I have to describe what happens to the child after he leaves my institution, an in-patient facility for the most part, and there's a day-care part too, so there's some connection

with the family and with the community. But the child's return to a community is significant, too. We've been particularly troubled because once we have delivered the minimum service to these youngsters we know that they will need continuing help, continuing monitoring, and when we return them to the community, where I think they should indeed go, we are not encouraged by the responses from some of the schools with children who have behavior problems or children whom they described as being dissident in school, or children most particularly who have academic problems. The schools are reluctant to take their responsibility,and to see that that's a role that they must play, that they have indeed a responsibility for education of all the children. Some of you may know that in Michigan recently a law was passed which requires the school system to be responsible for the education of all the school children from the age of four to twenty-five. No matter what their problem is, it is fully responsible for the education of those children.

I predict law suits will take place under these circumstances because schools have not met these kinds of needs and institutions like mine have been the recipients of many of these children whom I think the schools could indeed handle efficaciously. Devising minimums and maximums for that group of children is very difficult, as I said earlier. And I find the constant frustration of working with agencies, either pre- or post- or during the time that they are with us.

The other facet that interests me is that I must continue to put emphasis on how people are trained for the social services. I know that a person who becomes a professional usually comes from a class that perpetuates the kind of disadvantage that we talked about earlier. Schools tend to prepare children for their place in the society and teachers participate in this actively and inactively. But I often wonder what is happening in schools of education to preclude that. I know teachers in the school systems that I criticize, who

do an excellent job with the children. It's not because of the school system. It's because of those teachers. How they got that way, I'm not sure. I know other social service people, other kinds of agencies that do excellent work with the children that they serve, but I know that person. I know about the training that we try to give our child-psychiatric residents and other people who are in the mental health profession, and I know that one of the ingredients we attempt to instill is adequate feelings for another human being. I think that is really very basic. I don't know how you teach that, I'm not sure it's teachable. I'm not sure that it's formalistically necessary to teach it, but it's a practice that is necessary. Consequently, I have to put emphasis on not the overall reform of institutions, because I feel frustrated by that. The institution in which I work is a part of a large state department. If I wanted to work at the institutional level, I would have to deal at the State Department level, which is, in my estimation, beyond me at this point. As I recall, when I was on the Board of Education, it was at least possible to deal with the local school people, the local administration, and the people in the community. They were accessible. But I could not deal with the people at the state level. I did not know what they were doing or what they were thinking. And I certainly couldn't deal with the politicians in Lansing, and that produces a great deal of frustration.

I believe that reform has to come from the people, and must include a political consideration. I'm referring to reform in schools and all other services that are administered by governmental agencies or even private agencies that are regulated by government. I say political consideration because people have to understand not only that they need a change, but also that they are not getting the service that they are paying for, literally. They're certainly not getting the service they want. They may not even be able to define the service they want. In schools it's easy, but I cannot ask a three-year-old

child to tell me what he wants. Nor can I ask the parent to tell me. They look upon me as the professional who will make a diagnosis, and I must do that to the best of my ability and then relay information to them, allowing them then to ask questions. In my private practice, I ask every person who comes to me why he is there. It seems obvious when you go to a psychiatrist that the psychiatrist at least ought to know why you're there and that the client ought to know why he is there, but it becomes important for him to vocalize that in the open so that I can understand why he is there. And then I can tell him what I can do about why he's there or what he wants me to do about why he's there, if I can tell him what I am capable of doing once he has described it. For children it's different. But I even ask children, "Do you know why you're in my office?" Five-year-old children -- six, seven, certainly teenagers -- because many of the children do not come on their own. They come because their parents bring them. I think it's important for them to understand why they're in my office, too, in order to gain some modicum of understanding and cooperation. But I introduce that just to give a perspective on the whole business of delivering service to people in areas other than specifically educationally related institutions.

Peter Forsythe: First of all, Ron, I'm not sure that the three pieces in your model fit as well in other sectors as they do in education. I found myself attempting to make the pieces fit within areas that I know better than education, and I found in a number of respects it is substantially more complicated than the paper suggested. For example, the definition of client. It seems to me, in the school setting, particularly an individual school or neighborhood school setting, it is relatively easy to answer questions about the nature of the client population, who the constituents are, etc. But as you look at some other areas, and as you blew it out this morning in terms of larger institutions even in the educational field, where both clients and con-

stituents are spread over a larger geographic area, just to add one dimension of difficulty, it seemed to me it enormously complicated the process, and required some additional explanation to help me apply the principles to the more complex situations. Another point: I'm not sure where you come out on the numbers of good people and bad people in the system. My immediate reaction in reading the paper before your presentation this morning was that you had grossly overstated the strength of the existing social servants. If your purpose is to eliminate the negativism or pessimism that says "just give up on the whole thing and chuck it, start all over again," then I would support the position that after all, these are not bad people, they're not there intending to be destructive. But if your purpose is to define potential participants in a reform structure or partners with outside advocates in moving forward toward some substantial change, then I think you have to rate the vast bulk of those people, if not as a negative, at least as a zero. This morning, you discussed that in terms of "few" and "individuals," rather than any mass characterization. I think that whatever the purpose is, it's important to distinguish between the two. As I have examined the systems I have faced, the numbers of people who could separate themselves from their own individual payoffs and who really had any longing to make changes which would affect not only clients but their own situation, the numbers were relatively few than more.

I also question the value or the emphasis in the paper on the maximums for the internal reform agents. Not that that isn't part of the process. It seems to me it would be more instructive to spend more time on what you see as happening, the reason why you press the maximums. Really, the maximums won't fly internally any more than they will externally. That is, there are all kinds of pressures for anyone who is seriously interested in reform, to get beyond that stage very quickly and to begin to deal with the specific,

measurable issues of accountability that both give you some opportunity for success, because an internal reformer needs that as much as the external, and also because it will get you to the process which I think you want the internal person to come to, namely, of beginning that dialogue with the clients that will arrive at the specific. That wasn't as clear to me. It seems to me there's an overemphasis on the maximums strategy from an internal standpoint.

Bea Miller: I wanted to say to you, Harold, that in a state situation you are probably up against more types of bureaucracy, but if you are really asking what I believe you are asking, as to how you can fit the model into psychiatry, I'm going to give you a very simple example. In Roxbury, we have a clinic called the James Jackson Putnam Clinic that for years addressed only the needs of upper middle class kids. In more recent years, some attention was given to middle class kids, black and white, but for the most part, the people who found their way to the James Jackson Putnam Clinic in the middle of Roxbury were professors' kids and others. The people in Roxbury who had psychiatric problems found their way to the Judge Baker Guidance Center. At some point, the people in Roxbury decided that they would approach the James Jackson Putnam Clinic and ask it to be more responsive. Well, we found that we would need a critical mass of people inside who wanted change, and we did not find them. So we had to get together the mass inside (I don't use the phrase "change agents" any more because I think that's a graduate student phrase that doesn't mean much) so that folks inside and folks outside were applying equal pressure. What we had was a sufficient amount of pressure from outside to change the people inside. What we knew about psychiatry was very little. What one of the neighborhood parents knew about psychiatry was a great deal, because she happened to be the wife of a psychiatrist, so we got behind her in a flying wedge. We were able to overcome the pressure inside and to get in on what they like to call the community board, so that we could at the same time maximize

our influence and pressure from outside. What we asked for, very simply, was that they deal with the kids from the neighborhood in terms that we could understand, so that if a kid was thrown out of school for whatever, they would diagnose the case and tell us what needed to be done, do it, and do it right there on Townsend Street which is around the corner from where we live, rather than referring the child to Judge Baker, which is not around the corner from where we live. We also asked for some other very simplistic things such as not going into three years of Freudian analysis. In the school I was in, there were eighteen kids in grades three and four with four cases of siblings with five kids in the same room who had been in analysis or some kind of therapy since they were three years old. What we were asking for was some kind of short term treatment that would get the kids back in school so the parents would not be in the position of carrying the children to about five institutions, if they had five kids. That could be done, and that was done, after we got the pressure from outside to overcome the pressure inside, or we got in the inside. Those are the kinds of things that can be done in a model that has been tried.

Harold Lockett: I'm aware of that specific situation, and I know of a comparable kind of plan in Michigan through the Community Mental Health. Every county has a Community Mental Health Board which is supposed to deal with all kinds of emotional problems, with both children and adults in that community. That's the part of the State Department, but it's not a part of what I do. There's no direct connection with the community. In the instance that you spoke of, the lines are clearer in terms of community interacting and the kind of applicability of the model that Ron talks about. That's fine. The difficulty that I have with the agency in which I work is that it has always been a service-oriented agency. It hasn't always served all the people adequately since I've been there, I think. But the focus of all the work has been to do work with kids all the time, and by and large, not to indulge in

this long-term analytic technique. Psychiatry follows specialties in medicine and excludes people on the basis of race and education, and on the basis of money, primarily, because people just cannot afford it. The thing that the state provides is service at no cost. No one is excluded. That's what I really like about it.

The point is, you can't exclude people because of financial conditions. We exclude them for other reasons, but those can be handled much more efficiently. The model can work to some extent. If I take my thoughts about what I can do minimally, that's what I think the professionals have to decide. I can tell you what I can do for you. I can also tell you, "Don't bother me. Go someplace else because I can't do that for you." That's appreciated by the parents and the youngsters, too. Essentially, I do what you said. The parents ask me to see a youngster because I have some involvement in education and I know something about educational problems that children have, and the relationship between that and emotional problems and the relationship between that and perhaps organic problems. One of the things that I do is not only make the diagnosis but also tell them how their kid could best benefit by the setup they have in their school. The programs in their schools may not be adequate in my view, but they are there and I can't do anything about them. The best I can do is deal with the teachers and the principals about that child in that setting. And that's useful. I find teachers receptive to that sort of thing. I find that teachers are very frustrated by things they know nothing about. If you clarify for teachers some ramifications of the child's behavior, they feel better, even though I may not have said very much. They feel that because I said it, then it's adequate.

Ira Goldenberg: Getting more concrete makes Ron's paper more easily discussable. Maybe we're making the error of assuming homogeneity in social service institutions, when in fact, they're as heterogeneous as the kind of heterogeneity

we want to begin to appreciate within a single classroom or in a single school. Frankly, I had not been aware of that in my own head. I guess I can't get off the kick of optimism-pessimis, but I want to redefine it. If you're not optimistic, then your pessimism dictates doing other things, or approaching problems in different ways than optimism would suggest. It is not not doing anything. Let me give you an example. We had a youth center for kids sixteen years old. We got everybody nobody wanted. Send them to the RYC. We made two simple laws in the Residential Youth Center. One was that under no conditions was any staff member allowed to take a look at the diagnosis that had been written about the kid by anyone in the sixteen-plus years of that kids' earlier life. It was not allowed. If we caught anybody looking at someone's case history, he'd be fired, or she'd be fired. Simple law.

The second law we made was that we made a very sharp distinction between what we considered a kid being "messed up" and "messed over." Simple as that. And we made the assumption that our kids, regardless of background, whatever you want to call it, had been "messed over." "Messed up" implied the intrapsychic notion of some debilitating deficit. We felt very strongly that there was no such thing as treatment independent of the objective contradictions and conditions under which a kid lived. What that led to and why, I think, relates to Ron's paper. Maybe in a strange way I'm supporting the notion of minimums and maximums. But what we did followed from an ideological analysis that had nothing to do with minimums as the mental health profession would define them, or as the clients, even those who have been brainwashed by mental health professionals, would define their minimums. For example, we found kids getting better -- emotionally -- by helping to run a successful rent strike, rather than by being treated in any one form or another of directive or nondirective, supportive or nonsupportive treatment. We found kids learning to read and write by having to address themselves to how you organize boycotts, how you

make up signs for boycotts. I don't want to push it to its obvious regression. What I'm saying is that we decided, in an imperialist way, with or without consultation, that there were certain objective conditions that had to be dealt with; that these were conditions that had "messed over" kids; and that in dealing with these conditions, there would be enormous emotional, education, social, what-have-you benefits. I think in some cases it proved effective. Our definition of the problem and how to approach it, in fact, did not come out of, or maybe it did come out of, some kind of perverted definition of minimums. But if we hadn't focused on the clients' problems of trying to survive on a day to day basis, we would have been doing th kinds of things that I know have led to the perpetuation of the present conditions for most people who are poor.

Herm Coleman: Based on your previous comments, Ron, I think our perception of the question of cultural relevance is the same. I want to restate my concern slightly differently. Based on my observations of the development of minimal objectives in Michigan going into the fourth year, I don't believe that, given the nature of things in our society today, and the nature of social service institutions, that we are capable of relating to clients as constituents without increasing our perception in terms of cultural relevance. I say most social servants cannot internalize where their clients or constituents are coming from unless they have the frame of reference. I think that what is the exchange cannot be processed without a frame of reference. I say that when you change my awareness, you also change my expectations. I see the whole awareness piece being necessary to change the social servants' expectations.

Bob Singleton: I want to shift over to another point. When I began reading Ron's paper, I got a feeling that it was apologetic for gradualism, that there was an argument in it that the external change agent should be satisfied with

less than what most external change agents try to accomplish. Now I notice, Ron, you are modifying the term minimum with things like acceptable minimum, and I think that maybe there ought to be something in the beginning of the paper which indicates that.

Will Antell: I had somewhat the same sense of that, too. I kept mulling over in my mind, "How can good people do bad things?" That sort of clouded the issue a little bit. I thought you were a little too apologetic about that. Also, as I read the paper, I tried to do so from the perspective of an American Indian. I got rather excited, thinking in terms of the ultimate end result here, that being the community's determination of what the minimums or maximums might be. I am wondering, however, if you as a manager sense some limitations. If this model begins to operate, and the feedback that comes to the school from the community is stressing the kinds of points we have been discussing -- ethnicity, culture, etc. -- how do you handle it?

Ron: I'd like to ask a question of all of you in that respect. What is it you think a middle class, Protestant teacher would have to go through in the effort to make lower class, urban black children and their parents constituent? That is, what would be the nature of the inquiry and interaction that a white, middle,class teacher would have to make and engage in in pursuit of that teacher's coming to perceive of the lower class, black children and their parents as the teacher's constituents? I want to put that in a cultural context.

Alan Schmid: I'd like to raise different kinds of questions, which might be tied together by a concern with the resource allocation implications and reallocation implications of meeting some of the targets that Ron is talking about. For example, if we are going to meet the minimums that you're speaking of with respect to reading and mathematics, what do we have to give up? Is it simply a matter of using a different method? Does it imply major reallocations of the way we're now using our present resources? To give a perspective to that,

would we have a high school, or would we spend all our resources in the grade schools getting people to these levels?

I've done a little work looking at impacts of general health care on rural populations. With a given budget, I am faced with this kind of a question: I can give ten thousand people, for instance, some kind of minimal care, or I might be able to provide two thousand people with really super-duper, first-rate medical care. It strikes me that there are some tough trade-offs of this kind that have to do perhaps with minimum specifics, not minimum versus general, but two very specific things, but different things. Doctors don't like to talk to me about this because they have their own professional standards of what it is to have good care. They don't want to really admit that they can't give that to everybody. So the setting of a more modest goal, and trying to get everybody to that level, is professionally, they kind of fight. I guess you probably have the same problem in education.

Ron: You mention the trade-off, the cost-benefit analysis once the community defines minimum levels of elementary competence. What the trade-offs may be is a political question. It's up to the community to decide the answer. If the community is serious about its commitment to minimums, not only does it give up the high school, it gives up the football team in order to get that done, if the community is serious.

Ken Haskins: There were several terms in Ron's paper that haven't seemed to surface. One of them was the term respect, in the sense that a professional would have to have respect for the client. I think the concept of respect begins to deal with some of the questions that you are raising. When you ask what are our teachers expected to know about the variety of cultures with which they come into contact, you try to define a set of attitudes that would make teachers behave in a certain way toward a culture, with or without specific knowledge about it. But we don't really have to deal so much with attitude;

we can begin to alter behavior, at least to the extent that people can deal with it. I't like to just say one other thing. I know you don't want to talk about it. When the question of minimums comes up with the availability of resources, I think we can't really not deal with that either, because if we don't deal with that, resources begin to be distributed again on the basis of wealth or other kinds of things. When someone says, I can only give so much good health care, he is also making some decisions as to where this good health care will go. Generally speaking, you will probably find that the questions of disadvantage and so forth come up in the same terms as they always have, and then, in regard to the social services generally, they get reflected in other spots. We need to begin to tie in the variety of social services and what that means, because when social services break down in one area, particularly in a community that is used to special kinds of services, it raises the expectations of another agency. Thus, for example, if an area has a health service that's breaking down, that will strain the school to the point that it cannot even meet its own minimal standards.

Ken Tollet: I'm returning to my first question, because I wasn't satisfied with the response by Ken Haskins. The discussion this morning and this afternoon seems to me to suggest that there is a kind of pragmatic elegance to Ron's paper. The intervention earlier about the nature of society's pursuing goods and power, if pressed very far, I think would inevitably lead to defeatism, because I think it is unrealistic to believe that external reform advocates or internal reform advocates and most social services are going to radically transform our society in the next few days. Therefore, I'm getting more impressed with Ron's paper by the criticisms and comments that have been made, because it seems to me that it is very realistic and hardheaded and avoids the posturing which the oral tradition seems to nourish. However, it seems to me a model has come out here about the nature of education. It is essentially

a cognitive, intellectual enterprise, and I'm wondering if this isn't running counter to current research into the educational enterprise, that there is an affective component to learning. I think you partly anticipated that by saying that if we have to take into account the feelings of students' perception of themselves, racism in the community, in order to teach arithmetic and writing, then we ought to program that in. We would program that in not because of racism or the emotional problems of people, but because we can't perform these minimal tasks without dealing with racism or the emotional problems of people, which seems to me a rather persuasive response to that question. It also expresses a modesty that educators are not accustomed to, and will avoid. I think perhaps the problem that higher education has gotten into is proliferation of function and a kind of Messiah complex that suggests the educational institution, and for that matter, other social service institutions, can cure all the problems of society. If they can just do a good job in their sector, the rest of society, to a certain extent, can take care of itself. I'm getting more impressed with Ron's paper as the discussion goes on.

Bob Newby: I'm very much in agreement with Ken, If we take the notion that schools are political institutions, then we say, OK, we're not going to do any of that socialization stuff, but what we're going to do is to teach the three R's; and in a funny kind of way, we have deschooled society. What we once decided schools should do, we're not going to do any more. We're going to teach the Three R's. I think there's a lot to be said for it, but there's an obstacle. The obstacle is the major reason for having schools in the first place.

As for white teachers viewing the black community as constituents, I have some thoughts. I don't know that the bulk of white teachers in this society, even with all the sensitivity training, all of the other little -- even home visits -- are going to change that drastically. That's why I believe that

what you do have to do is go to something like minimums to hold them accountable for doing those things.

Bea Miller: First of all, I wanted to address Ron's question about what white teachers would have to do to properly perceive of blacks as constituents. I wrote down some things they might do: become hippies, lady bountifuls, helpers, move into the communities by virtue of love, marriage, or some other way. That's one way you find out about your constituents -- become a convert, or happen to be born into a family that is an anomaly to class or race.

I always argue with the title of the book Black Like Me because I don't know if you can do it other than being black like me, and I don't think that you can teach out of a cultural context. However, I taught fourteen years in an all-white school. I taught the kids to read and taught them to do a lot of things that they didn't want me to do, Bob, so I'm addressing your question directly. Having sent a child down to the office; no, having not sent her down, having gone down myself to find out how I could bring the child into my definition of how a nine-year-old should behave, I was told by the principal that she had never been asked how to make the child more responsive who was too quiet; that was not the kind of thing she was ever asked. She was always asked, "How do you make a child quiet who is too responsive?" So I'm saying, that even in that particular school, there was no desire to have children become assertive or to become anything more than what they were supposed to be in life, which was a poor, mechanicsville situation. They were to be fed into the industry of the area. But they could be taught to read, mainly because the curriculum and all the materials were geared to the dominant group, so I didn't have to do anything except stand there and be a teacher. Now, how you turn that around and do it in reverse, Ron, is a question that I guess leaves me in Herm's corner. I wonder if one can stand there and teach material that is already culturally relevant to one group to another

group without doing something about it? And I understand, on your minimum terms, one has to assume that in some way or other you are going to be less than pristine, in that the teacher is going to have to make that kind of . . .

Ron: I'll give you an example of what I mean by those minimums. Conceive of a classroom of lower class, inner city, black children, all of whom speak what is called dialect -- ghettoese, whatever. They come to the kindergarten and you're supposed to teach them to read. You've got yourself in this position where the school is comfortably neutral. It's not their job to respond to those children being black, dealing with cultural matters of that kind, but they have to teach them to read. Let's telescope the whole process, Herm, and I'll tell you where I think it comes out. The most instructional, effective response to such children is to make teachers bilingual, make the materials bilingual, and to teach English in the model that the English Language Institute represents. Or it is taught as a second language to a group of people who come speaking a native language that is other than English and all that that implies in terms of the linguistic respectability of their native language and the culture from which it comes. And that you do all of this, not in the name of cultural relevance, not in the name of respecting black children, but do it in the pursuit of instructionally effective devices. That's where, in my judgment, you are compelled to come out with such children. I don't think you will ever come out there. I don't think you can politically come out there if you go in saying that. I think it is a politically manageable instructional strategy if, in your discussing it, you stick with the question of instruction and you avoid political volatility of having so much respect for black culture that you think there is nothing wrong with the way black children talk.

Badi Foster: Some criticism. I think I basically liked the paper. It makes a great deal of sense. It's a fine, conservative statement, and I use conserv-

ative in the finer sense of the word. It's rooted in very fine logic of the nature of democracy and how power ought to be exercised in a democratic society, and I think you get that in the paper when you talk about cultural democracy. On a superficial level, everyone here would probably agree that the problem is that people aren't getting what they ought to be getting. It may very well be that what we have to do is look at the problem from a slightly different perspective to see whether or not that allows us to eventually come up with other strategies. I think, though, that in emphasizing the strategy, we don't really get at the kinds of issues that Will Antell raised, that Herm raised, which have to do with the general question of the paradigm, the world view, the theoretical framework out of which people derive their own prescriptions for living. Now that may be a sophisticated definition of culture, but that's really what one has to get at. I think the problem of conceptualization, and that's what you're really dealing with in the paper, requires one to avoid the twin problems of reifying something, turning something into an object which is already really alive, and then the reverse of that, falsely vivifying something which is dead. When we deal with concepts in terms of our own analysis, we must be careful. The way in which you use community in about five or six different ways in the paper, for example, prevents people from really getting at the kinds of strategies. That just means looking at it a little more carefully in terms of the internal agent and the external agent. What is critical is that there has got to be congruence, indeed, coherence between the paradigm of the internal agent and the paradigm of the external agent. Those are necessary conditions and they need to be articulated.

I came up to Boston to help design from scratch a four-year college of public and community service in which we were going to take community folks who've had lots of experience but no B.A., bring them in, provide a competency-based curriculum which would then produce people who would be able to go out

and people the kinds of systems that reformers and good folks wanted to create. When you talk about minimums, it's really concretizing the act of trying to write a competency-based educational system, and believe me, that is tough. The only way that one can do it is, first of all, have an absolute mastery of the subject matter that you're trying to transmit, and in fact, competency-based education is transforming the containers of knowledge. What we have failed to do, and we are failing miserably at this point, is because there is no agreement on the paradigm of what the nature of the problem really is. Now I believe that the nature of the problem, and it's manifested in oppression and cultural autocracy, is lodged in the ways in which self and others connect to each other. In this day and age, those various kinds of relationships are breaking, and most people have neither the will nor the capacity to refashion broken connections, and what we spend our time doing is masking those broken connections. So that in our college, we are not able to do what all of what you said is needed, in large part, because the faculty of that college could never come to grips with the agreement of what the nature of the problem is, and that speaks to the paradigm. As a result, we've agreed upon two or three basic skills about how to analyze. Break something down to its constituent parts and compare and contrast. Once we move beyond that to say, "OK, how do you write a competency that allows a person to go to work for the Clark Foundation, to work in Washington, D.C., or to work out at Nairobi College, a person to have, on the one hand, a perspective of what is minimal in the institution, but also what one ought to be able to do, to maintain two dimensions?" We haven't figured out a way to write that into those basic competencies which are going to be critical if we're going to do our job.

Herm Coleman: I was just going to say, based on my observations, and things I hear some others say here, I would suggest that you give some consideration to expanding your dialogue on minimal objectives. When you talk about a

consensus, Ron, what do you mean in terms of diversity?

Ron: It's easier to give you an example of what consensus is. The school district I was referring to in Michigan this morning is called Beaver Run, on the upper peninsula. Consensus means that the teachers and the parents of the pupils are so much alike in where they come from, in what they eat, how they entertain themselves, that they seem to have an implicit agreement about what the world ought to look like if they have their way. That makes it easy for the teacher to know what the parents want them to convey to their children. That means, for example, that they all agree that teachers ought to be authoritarian; they all agree that teachers ought to be able to spank children; they all agree on a lot of things. They have this consensus among and between them about why the school is there, what it's supposed to do, and relatively speaking, in those circumstances, the institutions work fairly well, and usually there the social servants are technically competent.

Here's where the difficulty arises. I once went to testify, along with Ken Haskins, to the Mondale committee on equal something or other, and they were talking to me about what good school systems were like and what bad systems were like. We were talking, and they asked me a lot about Detroit, and I kept saying things about Detroit, and finally Mondale said, "Well, Detroit must be a school system that is responsive to black children because Detroit is the only big city school system in the United States that has a black professional instructional population that exceeds the adult black population in the city." The upshot being, it has a lot of black teachers, and Mondale said that that must mean the success of their affirmative action program, that must mean that those schools are responsive to black children. I said, "No, they're not." In fact, if anything, Detroit is worse off, for that very reason. And the reason is this. The teachers in Detroit who are black are middle class people, upwardly mobile and all the rest. They derive their behavioral norms from

suburban white Detroit. In the name of their missionary zeal to help those black children that they genuinely love and care about, those black teachers are determined to make those inner-city black children over in the black-white image, and that precludes an agreement among and between the parents. The black teacher wants to socialize those children and wants to civilize those children and wants to teach them standard English; the parents want their children to learn to read. The parents say, "We don't give a damn about integration, we don't care about the socializing, we don't care about the manners, we just want our children to learn to read." But the black teachers want to integrate their children, and so on and so forth. And that causes such a fundamental lack of consensus, and they'll never get it. They will never get their consensus until the teachers in Detroit, regardless of their color, conceive of who they work for. They don't conceive of anybody that doesn't live in Detroit, and you know . . . to apply that to Indians.

Once I had this absolutely grotesque conversation with a very prestigious advocate of American Indians, who happens to be a culturally autocratic, flakey, (expletive deleted). That guy gave me a success story, Will. He told me he had adopted an Indian child and that child he had adopted was a model of usccess. He told us when he knew it. His adopted child got on the plane to go back to Princeton to go to school and invited his father to come to a cocktail party so that the father could meet the son's blond, upper-class, white fiancee. I don't object to that boy marrying that girl, but I do take some exception to the father saying that that is a success story. And I said to that man who is quite well-known nationally, I said to him, "It sounds to me as though you just wiped out an Indian." He didn't quite see it that way.

Herm Coleman: You used an analogy of the upper peninsula of a particular school district, but the upper peninsula in Michigan has, on the average, a higher rate of assessment than the lower peninsula where we have the diversity.

Just to make a point on the cultural relevance issue that was raised here, in the upper peninsula there are five pockets, areas where there are First Americans. But the dropout rate for those First Americans up there is 86%. While the system is addressing itself to the needs of the majority who are white, they aren't doing a damn thing for the First Americans there. That says to me that there is a deficit in the system, Ron.

Will Antell: That's the reason I raised the question about consensus. You can have it between the school and the community, but within each one that consensus is hard to . . .

Ken Haskins: Does that relate to your question of constituency, because I have been in communities where the call was to educate the white, and the counterpart of that was to not educate the blacks, but that really has to do with people seeing their constituency as the white, even though the whites were a minority in that community. If that's the case, that's handled, maybe not in depth in Ron's paper.

Peter Forsythe: It seems to me that the paper runs the risk, in its present form, of getting people off the track from the basic theories you're trying to propound about social change and getting them into debating with you or wondering about the 3-R strategy as an appropriate one. You might find some way to deal with that. Our whole discussion here dealt in a lot of ways with "Is that really what ought to be the proper strategy for a group?" That may be your personal belief, and many of us may share it, but I don't think that's the point of your paper. The illustration runs the risk of consuming the basic principle.

Bob Singleton: I wanted to respond to Ron's question about what does a WASP need in order to make parents and students constituents. I think it's partially begged because we've already talked about what the schools do. In the words of a former superintendent of schools, Crowler, in Los Angeles, the schools

exist to transmit the culture, and of course, by "the culture" he meant the white culture. Within culture, I think he meant more than just appreciation for white people. I think he also meant skills that white people use to survive. I think what you're saying is that we'll deculturalize that and just transmit the skills and we have it. In that sense, what the WASP teacher needs to do is partially begged. But I think when you think about it a little further, you realize that there's a lot more to it than just deculturalization, because there are more levels than just where the teacher winds up when he's dealing with the kids. The teacher has already gone through professional schools which feed these social systems. All public servants have gone through some system of acculturalization and preparation which puts them in a position to succeed only if they accept all that garbage. So the teacher who is going to effectively turn the students and the parents into constituents is going to have to also fight a system, a system that they are attached to at that moment, a system that they have already come through. They can either start fighting it while they're coming through, in which case they will probably fail and get kicked out of the system, or they can start fighting it after they get through it, or they can fight it before they get into it.

What I'm saying is that there's a complex layer or set of layers of change that are needed by the internal change advocate which is kind of minimized in a sense by the way you kind of lay out their role as you stated in the paper. But I still think that the problem that you get out through this paper is that most of these institutions that we're dealing with were created in the '30's, save the educational system that was created earlier, and they were really created to deal with the problem which existed then. The education system was created to transmit the culture. The other social systems were created to deal with certain kinds of problems as they saw them at the time, and they haven't changed. They are still transmitting the culture the same way they

were doing it in Washington's day. You can probably take a reader from those days and teach a person to read much better than you can use any other kind of discipline and keep a person up. You certainly can't teach a person engineering from something that was written back in 1776. These social service systems which were created long ago (the most recent were in the 1930's) haven't changed. That means that we really never had a theory by which to approach them for change or to even conceptualize which way we need to change them. So the internal change advocate, I think, needs something like this paper to begin to at least conceptualize, because just sitting in there trying to change them with a little theory, of course, is really a waste of time.

Ezra Naughton: Let me go back to where we started by saying that I do share your optimism to a great extent, and I share your feeling that, as educators, whatever happens to be our particular field of endeavor, we must have a sense of optimism, indeed, if we're going to be effective and function in whatever area in which we do function. I feel, though, that, coming to a brief critique of the paper, it's an exciting one in terms of what it's designed to lay before us and to ask us to consider. I'm a little disturbed about your insistence about cultural neutrality because, given the racist society in which we live, and the realities of the society in which we live and which we have to develop strategies to change, I think this is very unrealistic.

The business of minimums as you presented it, as I understand it, is very good, because what has happened in the development of education and other social institutions is that they have taken on too much. They have attempted to do too many things for too many people, and in this way they have become probably not only cumbersome, but in some ways obsolescent, because as our society was becoming increasingly complex and increasingly complicated, they no longer were viable means to achieve the ends which they were designed to serve. Perhaps we will be able to make some kind of change in these kinds of social

systems by emphasizing minimums rather than trying to do too much, because the very fact that we have tried to do as much as we have been trying to do by all these social institutions, social systems, I think is one of the reasons they are not as effective as they might be.

So far as strategies are concerned, it seems to me that one of the first things we have to do is to determine the minimums. Determine them, and also to determine ways in which we are going to arrive at a consensus, because that is extremely critical if one the minimums have been determined and the maximums have been explored, we are going to work in any significant way towards achieving them. So determine minimums and ways in which we arrive at a consensus. The other important thing I would mention is the business of developing strategies for re-educating or restructuring the social institutions so that they can achieve the ends which we think they should, and to serve the constituents and clients whom they are designed to serve.

Jeannette Feely: It seems to me that there needs to be . . . the use of strategies, of models implemented in a variety of communities, and maybe several different agencies. Perhaps we should start with one and find out to what extent does the strategy or the model that's put there work. That's not something that I see can be completed in a year or two years; it's a long range kind of thing which I think needs to be done. I'm concerned as much as anybody else about whether or not black kids are taught to read or whether or not kids, period, are taught to read. There is a confused idea in this society that kids have to learn to read by age six. In fact, that is not really the case. There are kids who learn to read at three, black and any others, and there are kids than don't learn to read until seven or until eight, and then there are kids who fool enough people into believing that they can't read at all in elementary school. Yet when they get to junior high school, they're reading certain kinds of things because of certain kinds of experiences that they've

had that have promoted them into this.

Harold Lockett: One of the things I've been concerned about in general is how to decide who should be in the social service areas. I think that schools struggle with this concept. They get people to certain levels and it's too late to do anything about it when it becomes obvious that that person ought not to be there. That creates more problems on top of this system. Conversely, we don't know what makes a person become successful or become a successful social service worker. What criteria do we use in the schools of education? What do we use in training people in medical school and post medical school training? How do we deal with residents and that sort of thing? I think that the reform or the reorganization is going to come about because people want it to come about, and not only because of the constituents' desire to have it come about. It has to be, in part, because the people who work in an area, want it to also come about, and want to do a more adequate job. I'm sure that people are not fooled by their inadequacies. They know they're not giving adequate service, but they may not know the reason why.

What constitutes a good training program? How do you motivate people who should be in it to be in it? And how do you prevent those who should not be in it from getting there? I think these are difficult questions.

The other thing that concerns me in my area is that I see the relationships between social agencies as being dysfunctional in many ways, creating problems for me or anybody else in any given individual agency. Therefore, when you begin to look at service given, perhaps there should be some look at the coordination of interlocking services, because I don't think children make it by school alone. They make it by all the kinds of facilities that act upon them in their community. This is especially true as I pointed out in children who have some visible, or in the case of the emotionally disturbed, invisible handicap. So that services, and they have to be long term, not in the one

place, but they often are long term, they have to be followed. How can there be greater coordination between interlocking services? The other thing is that in my field, I'm intrigued by the idea of maximums and minimums because I believe, as others have said here, that clearly one very excellent point the paper makes is that you have to define the minimum goals. I think you have to define them for yourself: the minimum goal you want to achieve, or the client wants to achieve, that has to be defined and it has to be a consensus eventually. The intriguing thing is that it is easier to do that in the schools, I think. You can say reading, writing, and arithmetic, but in the social agencies which deal with interpersonal relationships, by and large, defining what you do in that kind of agency is a more difficult task. In some of the social sciences it's more vague than in others. But if we can integrate the concept of minimums in psychiatry, particularly, it would be an excellent contribution.

Bob Singleton: Now we're around to research again. One of the reasons it's difficult to deal with a culturall plural model is that then we have to deal with the whole system, and we're no longer dealing with the nexus between the kid and the teacher. Maybe we ought to take a look at the whole well, and all the poison in it, as it comes down to that nexus. Maybe one of the research things we would want to undertake would be to go to professional school by professional school that produces all of these social servants, and look to see to what extent cultural autocracy is part of that whole poisoning system and what can be done to extract some of it so that consideration of minimums can go beyond the one example that you put out, which is just to teach the three R's to the kid and forget cultural pluralism. If cultural pluralism could, in fact, also be part of that, then some of the issues and questions we are all lamenting about, like how you can get a racist teacher to somehow be culturally neutral, might be answered.

Ken Haskins: Two things: One is that I get more and more confused around the concept of culturally neutral, and I'll tell you why. From this discussion there are some things that should be clarified. First of all, if you begin with a society that develops racist people and then you have to do something to make those people neutral, that means that what you have to put into it is something -- I don't know what to call it, counterculture -- something other than neutral. It has to be in the opposite direction to bring it to neutrality. Somehow that's not handled at all and when people try to talk about what's being done to do it, they fail because we're not talking about neutrality. If you want to go from racism to neutrality there has to be some powerful force that's pulling it in that direction. Goldenberg struggled over here and didn't want to say that what he had done was to set minimums in his work with adolescents. I would suspect that there are a lot of places where people have attempted to do things that fit into your frame, Ron, but were never defined in the way you define minimums. I listen and I try to think what it was at Warwick School that I took as a minimum. I work in residential treatment centers for kids. I originally got interested in education by the fact, as you said, that many kids were coming from schools and when I worked with them, I really felt they had no need to do that. The thing that the parents said to me that I know I really followed most was that they wanted less suspensions and expulsions. I immediately said, "We will not suspend or expel any child." Then I had to explain to the parents, which then touches on the other thing, that that meant they were going to have to allow me to have all the problems in the school that would be in the street, but I wouldn't expel anybody. And we did not expel or suspend any children and we even moved from there then, which goes from the minimum, to accept any kid who came. We then had handicapped kids and emotionally disturbed children. But that was a minimum for the parents; that was not the minimum. The parents said many things but that's the one

I remember that I grasped upon and insisted upon. It was taken out of the realm of anything the teachers could do. They could not suspend or expel children. I suspect that there are places where people have tried to do this without defining it in these terms, and I wonder if we could maybe capture some of those and see what went into them and whether or not your theory has some kind of validity in practice. I would also suggest that we avoid what happened here, that we talk at least this time about individual institutions. The ability to talk about a school and talk about a school system are two different things. When you try to talk about a school system, particularly if we try to look back, it sort of boggles the mind. I think individual agencies or even pieces of an agency might be in the direction.

Will Antell: When we talk about social intervention and changing institutions in research, how do you do something with the Bureau of Indian Affairs? That agency touches the hearts of every Indian in the country. By taking this kind of model, Ron, is there a way to project this on a smaller basis and graduate to the largest? I don't know if that question can even be resolved. The other question is very intriguing, the one that you asked. Given all these circumstances that we have, what do you do with the white teachers in this process? We'd be hard pressed to help with some very viable and legitimate kind of responses.

Alan Schmid: As I suggested before, I think we need to better inform all of the decision makers, both clients and constituents, of some of the trade-offs involved, and some of the things that we've talked about doing, the ones I suggested, the quality and the general level of attainment. I suppose that this is just a matter of trade-off between the dominant majority and the minority, you might say as a strategic device, don't tell them. I suspect that at least we ought to know whether there are also some trade-offs within what we call the minority. I get the feeling that there is not a complete

agreement as to what is wanted within what is called the minority community. I don't want to seize upon the sample that Ken gave, and accommodate students out of a different behavioral, cultural norm. The question that comes to me is, what's the cost of that, and to other minority students? In other words, does that slow the other class down? That's kind of the question that we need to answer. I look over the reform movements of the last ten years, and I'm struck by the fact that we've taken what appear to be good ideas, and we found that they created some other problems that were worse than things we thought we were trying to solve. I just wish that we had understood those trade-offs a little better.

Ken Haskins: Let me try to answer. It goes both ways. A question that also hasn't come up is that, and you avoid it, Ron, is the question of values, which you say you don't deliberately -- but once you decide on a program of inclusion and not exclusion, you begin a set of values in which even that behavior begins to change very drastically because you begin to . . . a kid who was ordinarily put out of school because of behavior, as you continue to let him know that he is wanted and you want to keep him, that then changes that whole thing so that the trade-off will go in both directions, and not necessarily in one only.

Peter Forsythe: I want to get in my oar on the cultural neutrality question. Seems to me either cultural neutrality requires putting in an anti-racist force, or it requires trying to pull out all of the cultural elements so that it is acultural. And to do that not only may be counterproductive in terms of being able to teach people of a variety of cultures, you gave the example of trying to get materials that . . . and obviously the culture there followed the reading objective rather than the other way around. But it seems to me that's the most fertile of all grounds for the subtle racism in this WASP teacher you described. It may be wrong, but it seems to me, purely from a standpoint of trying to deal with that, the important thing is trying to insist

upon content which has culturally diverse substance as the best way to deal with the otherwise subtle, but will come through racism, will thrive in an acultural setting.

Secondly, your paper deals with trying to meet the needs of broadly defined minority students, by adding cultural dimensions about minorities, for the minority themselves in the teaching process. I think that's a very, very important ingredient to have in the educational process for the majority group, and it can't be overlooked even though it goes beyond the thesis of this paper. In terms of specific training and research, I looked on one thing frankly, and that is by case method or otherwise, maybe that comes from my legal training, both in education and social work, I've been more acutely aware of it in social work but I think it may apply in education just as well, the necessity of training people for political change analysis, how to identify power groups, how to recognize opportunities and evaluate various strategies and so on, whether or not they see any agenda for reform at the present time. We were talking about Harvard and institutions in general, and too often, unless you are out to reform this thing or that thing in a specific way, you don't teach the skill of political analysis and social reform. Every educator and every social servant, in this broad context, has to be exposed to that skill. I haven't yet found a school that even contended that it tried to do that job.

Bob Newby: I would like to see what an institution that does the three R's, as compared with a school, might look like. I'd like to see what the outcomes of that are for students. In some ways, I guess I'm rather cynical because I think that probably if every black kid could read, write, and do computations, there would still be another hoop on the ring for people to jump to, at least that's where I am at. I guess the real thing just has to do with seeing if this particular design will fly. In its outcomes, how does it stack up?

Herm Coleman: There is such a school. There is a black Catholic school in

the inner city of Chicago that deals with the three R's, cultural relevance, and religion. It's been one of the most successful schools in the country.

Ezra Naughton: The Amadon School, where they emphasize almost exclusively the three R's seems to have had some success, but as the school population . . .

Herm Coleman: I would like to take the position that Ron's model is a good model and have us look at what needs to be the support system in order for the model to become operational. What kinds of things need to happen, say pre-in-service kinds of things, for everybody to understand what the ground rules are, what we mean by minimum performance objectives. So that the constituent and the social institution are congruent in what we're talking about, what our expectations are, and how we're going to go about achieving them. I see that being a limitation in the Michigan model, for example. The community doesn't understand that it costs money to do what we're talking about. It isn't going to happen with the same amount of revenue. When you get to the support system, it's always compromise because everybody is looking at it within the same frame of reference that they've always looked at educational programs. Assuming that the model is beautiful, what is the support system that we need in order for that to become operational? I'd also like us to research for a notion of inclusion of the cultural component. I don't want to belabor the issue. I guess everybody knows where I am on that question. I just don't see how we can become operational, be effective, deal with those racist folks who in the classroom had a culturally neutral perspective. I just don't see how it can happen.

Bea Miller: I think if Ron doesn't change his paper, doesn't add the cultural component, then we will find ourselves with no people to teach the kids, because the cultural component is there. It works negatively for black kids, poor kids, brown kids, and what no. The other thing is, I think, Ron is approaching the theory and I think when he does the next component, which is to try to gather

up all these social service agencies that have done things, he will come up with the theory. The theory will not be in part as, I don't want to use the word sterile, but the reading, writing, and arithmetic seems a bit sterile. I would like to know another thing. You're dealing with K through what, in terms of reading and writing? When you say the minimum performance standard is reading, writing, and arithmetic, when would you cut it off? At what grade level?

Ron: Six.

Bea Miller: Six. Then I think you need to add another component, for where does one go from there and with what and with whom?

Ezra Naughton: That's on the note I wanted to raise a query about. For the most part, not at all considering higher education, I wanted to raise that and this seems to be an appropriate junction to do so. Would you care to comment? Is it relevant to secondary or post-secondary education?

Ron: I probably ought to put something in there that says this does not apply. It doesn't apply to either secondary schooling or to higher education because to the extent that I have done any work in thinking about that and of the stuff that I have in draft form that applies to secondary and higher education, it is absolutely cultural. Herm would be more than pleased with that. But I'm not ready to handle that, obviously. All of you have pointed out that I'm not through with this, but I must say, though, that it seems to me it will be easier for me to predict when I am through with this part. There is one thing I'm a little reluctant to do on the research agenda and I'll stop there. I have thought about what Bob said about testing it. But I really have a lot of trouble with that because it seems to me that that is so manipulative for me to get the resources and get the kind of research grant that allows you to go into a community and manipulate it this way. I really don't choose to do that. I'll tell you what I have chosen to do, Bob, to deal with the issue.

What I'm trying to do -- and this is, as you say, a long run thing -- what I'm trying to do is, in the coming months and maybe years, come into possession of a description of two kinds of things. One, to come into possession of a description of every organized citizen intervention that I can get onto. The preliminary work in that regard suggests that I can get onto a lot. Jane Browning, who is in the room, has been working on that quite substantially, and it's her job to answer to me the questions of feasibility of that study that you were referring to. By preliminary indications, it does seem to be feasible, manageable, and so forth. But to come into possession of a description of every organized citizen effort and the varieties they represent and to do an analysis, to do an analysis of the tactics and the context of this design, to see whether or not you can look, not at what you impose on people, but look at what they have either done or are doing and see whether or not, when you break them out, one of the things we are going to have is a seminar here of exclusively community people to get them to answer two questions for us. One, what is the community's definition of good social service? Two, what is the community's description of a good social servant? To see whether or not we can take that and whether or not it is at all applicable to the professional constraints that describe the way we come at these things. That's one project. The other project that was suggested to me out of this, which is in about the same condition as the work on this citizen intervention, is I want to come into possession of a description of every activity in the country that calls itself contributing to multi-racial, multi-ethnic, multi-class interaction, because there the theory says that those multi-ethnic, multi-culture settings that work best, come closest to being genuinely culturally democratic and that they work least when they are a subterfuge for assimilation. The point is, that for my purposes, those are the two things I've been pursuing that come closest to being a research effort, although a number of things

have been suggested to me by these conversations and I'm not quite sure how they shape up. I'm really glad, for our purposes, that we have been, and that I will get a chance in a quieter way to look at what some of you were saying, and to see what some of the implications of it were.

Badi Foster: The research agenda that I have is the one that I've been struggling with for two years,and that is, how in the heck to build a college of public and community service which embodies every question that was raised here? Perhaps that can be one of the things that can be included in your composite of success and failure that would deal with higher education.